DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 196 LI 003 831

AUTHOR	Roberts, A. Hood; Woyna, Adam G.
TITLE	Experiment in Fast Dissemination of Research in Selected Fields in Linguistics. Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-0239
PUB DATE	Aug 72
GRANT	OEG-3-9-180239-0046(095)
NOTE	31p.; (1 Reference)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Experimental Programs; *Information Dissemination; *Information Needs; *Information Sources; *Linguistics

ABSTRACT

The project was designed to develop a mechanism for the distribution of free bulletins of abstracts of accepted papers with the full versions available on microfiche or in hard copy from a commercial service bureau. However, the project did not succeed in attracting enough participants to justify its continuation. Because of its experimental nature and the lack of data, the conclusions reached were largely speculative. They are as follows: (1) actual information needs in the fields covered should have been determined by preliminary studies, (2) subject areas covered by the project were not suitable for a fast dissemination experiment, (3) new publication outlets had already been created in linguistics, (4) the project did not provide ego satisfaction for the authors, (5) the participation rules were too elaborate, (6) the project did not uncover conclusive proof of the existence of special interest groups in its fields of coverage. The report includes a set of recommendations for those who might want to organize a similar program in the social sciences. Appended are a description of document handling and organizational procedures, as well as the description of the project's predecessor, Program for the Exchange of Generative Studies. (Author/NH)

ED 066196

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OE BLLR
LI

Final Report

Project No. 9-0239
Grant No. OEG-3-9-180239-0046 (095)

A. Hood Roberts, Project Director
Adam G. Woyna, Project Manager

Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

EXPERIMENT IN FAST DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH IN SELECTED FIELDS IN LINGUISTICS

August 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Research and Program Development
Division of Library Programs
Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology

LI 003 831

ABSTRACT

The project, Experiment in Fast Dissemination of Research in Selected Fields in Linguistics, was designed to develop a mechanism for the distribution of free bulletins of abstracts of accepted papers with the full versions available on microfiche or in hard copy from a commercial service bureau. For most of the duration of the project, papers were refereed, different types of abstracts (informative, indicative, mini-abstract) were used for each of the three fields covered, papers were submitted in camera-ready form, etc. However, the project did not succeed in attracting enough participants to justify its continuation. Because of its experimental nature and the lack of data, the conclusions reached were largely speculative. They are as follows: (1) actual information needs in the fields covered should have been determined by preliminary studies, (2) subject areas covered by the project were not suitable for a fast dissemination experiment, (3) new publication outlets had already been created in linguistics, (4) the project did not provide ego satisfaction for the authors, (5) the participation rules were too elaborate, (6) the project did not uncover conclusive proof of the existence of special interest groups in its fields of coverage.

The report includes a set of recommendations for those who might want to organize a similar program in the social sciences. Appended are a description of document handling and organizational procedures, as well as the description of the project's predecessor, Program for the Exchange of Generative Studies (PEGS).

Final Report

Project No. 9-0239
Grant No. OEG-3-9-180239-0045 (095)

A. Hood Roberts, Project Director
Adam G. Woyna, Project Manager

Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

August 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Research and Program Development
Division of Library Programs
Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology

PREFACE

The project, Experiment in Fast Dissemination of Research in Selected Fields of Linguistics, funded by the U.S. Office of Education on June 1, 1969, was brought to a close on June 30, 1972.

The project, looked upon and funded as an experiment, did not succeed in attracting a cohesive and large enough group of participating scholars to justify its existence beyond the termination date of the present contract. However, while an effective information exchange mechanism within special interest groups in the language sciences was not organized, a number of interesting insights into the workings of information exchange habits among language scholars was obtained. It is hoped that these will prove useful to those who may be planning similar activities in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	
Introduction	1
Project Description	2
Procedures	3
Operational Data	7
Conclusions	8
Recommendations	15
Appendix I	17
Appendix II	19
Appendix III	20
Appendix IV	23
Appendix V	24
Appendix VI	26

INTRODUCTION

The project, Experiment in Fast Dissemination of Research in Selected Fields in Linguistics, was designed to develop a fast information dissemination mechanism in selected fields in linguistics by publishing abstracts of accepted papers which were too theoretical for inclusion in the ERIC collection and by making full versions available at minimal charge from a commercial service bureau.

The need for establishing and testing various information dissemination mechanisms for special interest groups has long been recognized. The increasing activity in scholarly research, particularly during the last two decades, resulted in increasing quantities of information to be scanned and digested. The volume of new material could not be processed on a current basis by the traditional channels of information dissemination, such as journals, books, and other research publications. While the growing number of publishing media shortened the time lag, it added to the mass of printed material which the scholars had to read in order to keep up with new developments in their fields of interests. Voicing their discontent, the scholars began to express an interest in finding alternatives. An immediate solution was the revival on a more formal basis of the invisible colleges, which in the past served as an informal mechanism for the exchange of information among members of special interest groups.

One such effort in the language sciences was the Program for the Exchange of Generative Studies (PEGS), started in early 1967 by a small group of Massachusetts Institute of Technology scholars, and operated later for a time by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) (for a description of the PEGS project, see appendix I).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In 1969 the Center for Applied Linguistics applied for and received a modest grant from the U. S. Office of Education for an "Experiment in Fast Dissemination of Research in Selected Fields in Linguistics". The project's primary goal was fast dissemination of original research papers including:

(a) reprints of reports and papers which appeared in varied sources, such as, for example, phonetics journals;
(b) the reports of the various research laboratories;
(c) selected materials referring to linguistics from research reports covering other fields as well, such as the reports of the Electronics Laboratory at MIT;
(d) reports and the state of the art papers from the various programs at the Center.

The fields of coverage included (a) computational linguistics, (b) social dialect studies, (c) English grammar, (d) Uralic studies, (e) metrics, (f) Languages of the World (special project), (g) Yugoslav contrastive series (special project), (h) state of the art papers in any field.

A wide variety of materials and areas was selected for coverage during the first phase of the project to permit the selection of two or three fields as the best candidates for the experiment proposed for the project's second phase, as well as the identification of other special interest groups which might exist.

It was understood that less theoretical papers of immediate interest to language teachers were to be included in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) collection and would not be handled by the project. Drawing on the lessons learned from PEGS, a number of new procedures were introduced. These included the publication of subject-oriented abstract bulletins containing abstracts of papers submitted for dissemination and the availability of full texts from a commercial service bureau on microfiche or hard copy. Furthermore, papers in all of the series were to be refereed by an editorial board composed of subject matter specialists recruited from the Center's staff and from other academic institutions. The abstract bulletins were offered free of charge.

PROCEDURES

Phase I

The existence of the project was announced in a number of publications in the field of linguistics, such as The Linguistic Reporter, The Finite String, ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics Bulletin, Newsletter of the American Dialect Society, etc. In addition, over 1,500 handouts describing the project were distributed at a number of meetings and conferences throughout the country.

Expecting a flood of participants and material, CAL was surprised to experience exactly the opposite. Within the first three months only 25 individuals requested that their names be placed on the mailing list and the project received only four documents for distribution. Following the receipt of 10 papers in the field of computational linguistics, the Association for Computational Linguistics' newsletter, The Finite String, carried abstracts of seven articles, listing the National Cash Register Company as the supplier of full texts. In order to offer users additional options, an agreement was negotiated with the Bell and Howell Company whereby Bell and Howell would service the field of contrastive studies by supplying duopage (back-to-back) hard copy and microfilm, as well as microfiche.

Continuing publicity raised the number of those who wished to receive the free abstract bulletins but attracted very few papers.

Phase II

By the summer of 1970 it became obvious that the project would have to be reorganized with concentration on fewer, more productive groups. Following a number of meetings between executive officers of societies involved and senior CAL and project staffs, most areas then covered were dropped and the following three selected as future targets: (1) English grammar, (2) psycholinguistics, and (3) contrastive studies. Consultants advised narrowing the scope of the project in an effort to attract "literature producers" and to create a feeling of exclusiveness among the members of each group. (For copy of the announcement see Appendix II)

Under the re-constituted project each of the three areas would have its own abstract bulletin issued free of charge to interested scholars and microfiche or hard copy were to be supplied at reasonable prices by only one source. (For copies of the first three pages of one of the bulletins see Appendix III) In order to permit later assessment of users' preferences, authors were requested to supply indicative abstracts for English grammar, informative for psycholinguistics, and mini-abstracts for contrastive studies. Those wishing to receive abstract bulletins were to provide at least six self-addressed envelopes (in order to save the project the costs connected with the maintenance of mailing lists). Each participant was to fill out a brief questionnaire concerning the usefulness of the project following the receipt of the 6th, 12th, 18th, etc. issues of the abstract bulletin.

5,000 flyers describing the project in its new form were mailed to members of the Linguistic Society of America and to several hundred libraries. Announcements appeared in a number of journals and other publications, such as the journal of the American Council on Foreign Language Teaching, Foreign Language Annals, whose editors agreed to list relevant abstracts as a service to its membership. At the same time abstract bulletins in constrastive studies and psycholinguistics were mailed to some 200 individuals who sent in pre-addressed envelopes.

Phase III

When the passage of six months did not bring about an increased number of papers, but resulted only in a larger mailing list, the project directors convened another meeting to solicit comments from other linguists. Those who attended offered the following opinions:

1. The paucity of data should not be interpreted as a lack of potential.
2. The fields to be covered were selected intuitively rather than as a result of preparatory studies of information exchange patterns and needs within the field of linguistics.
3. Publicity efforts, particularly through personal contacts,

should be increased.

4. Psycholinguistics, because of poor performance, should be dropped in favor of another field.
5. Document processing and dissemination procedures should vary with the fields of coverage to allow for a maximum number of combinations to be reviewed when assessing the project's usefulness.
6. Exchange of information among members of invisible colleges constitutes an important, although as yet unexplored, area in the field of information science, and its investigation should be continued.

Accordingly, the group recommended that one year's extention without additional cost to the Government be requested for the project.

The areas of coverage and new procedures were drafted as follows:

1. English Grammar

   a. Scope

      Papers on English phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics as treated within the framework of modern theories of linguistic analysis, e.g., transformational, tagmemic, stratificational, structural, etc. (Abstracts (100-200 words) should be of the indicative type, i.e., a broad statement of the contents and manner in which the information is presented.)

   b. Method of Dissemination

      Documents up to 30 pages to be distributed free of charge to qualified scholars in hard copy reproduced at the Center; documents over 30 pages to be available on microfiche from a service bureau.

   c. Method of Announcement of Abstracts

      The Center's newsletter, The Linguistic Reporter, and other publications whose editors will agree to cooperate.

2. Contrastive Studies in Linguistics

   a. Scope

      Contrastive analyses and error analyses; studies of the methodology of contrastive analysis and of its theoretical basis; studies of the theoretical implications of contrastive linguistics for general linguistics as well as of the implications for contrastive linguistics of such other fields as psychology and computational linguistics.
      (Abstracts (30-50 words) should be of the mini-abstract

type, i.e., consisting principally of key words describing the contents.)

b. Method of Dissemination

Hard copy and/or microfiche from the service bureau.

c. Method of Announcement of Abstracts

Separate abstract bulletin whose frequency will be dictated by the volume of material submitted for dissemination.

Renewed publicity efforts were undertaken such as notices in linguistic publications, announcements at conferences, and word of mouth. Once again the results were negligible.

OPERATIONAL DATA

1. Statistics - see Appendix IV
2. Document Handling and Other Office Procedures - see Appendix V
3. Cost Factors - see Appendix VI

CONCLUSIONS

1. Actual information needs in the fields covered should have been determined in preliminary studies.

The amount of the grant did not permit preliminary studies to determine which areas, not covered by ERIC, were in need of fast dissemination service. Areas were selected informally during the various stages of the project through consultations with a relatively small number of scholars in the various fields and the Center's senior staff. Almost all those consulted while the project was being planned agreed that there was a definite need for such services and predicted instant success.

2. The subject-matter areas covered by the project proved unsuitable.

a. Computational Linguistics

Computational linguistics evolved from the efforts of a small, highly-specialized group who in the 1950's and early 1960's worked exclusively on natural language machine translation problems. It lost some of its identity when in 1965 most machine translation efforts came to an end. Since that time, computational linguistics has branched off into other areas, such as information retrieval, artificial intelligence, teaching, etc. When this area was included in the project, it was erroneously thought that the invisible college of machine translation days was still in existence. However, experience has proved otherwise.

b. Social Dialect Studies

The advent of a new awareness of social problems during the last decade spurred a number of research efforts into the nature of black English and the language problems of other minorities. It was predicted that this field would grow in importance with an attendant growth in new literature. As it turned out, the field produced fewer papers than expected. A number of papers which the project did receive were of general interest and as such were processed for ERIC.

c. English Grammar

It was hoped that English grammar, including as it did

generative studies, would attract former PEGS clientele. Unfortunately, by the time the project got underway, these scholars had established a different literature disseminating mechanism and did not avail themselves of the project's services. The interests of other scholars in the field of English were either too specific or too general to permit their forming special interest groups for information exchange purposes.

d. Psycholinguistics

The project selected this field, which includes theoretical and applied linguists, language teachers, psychologists, etc., hoping to uncover the existence of special interest groups which did not have an information exchange mechanism of their own. These hopes did not materialize, perhaps because of a lack of controversial new theories or because the general nature of the field does not lend itself to the formation of invisible colleges. The few well-known producers already have a number of publishing outlets for their articles. In addition, a number of submitted papers were found to be of interest to the community of language scholars rather than research linguists and as such were processed for the ERIC system.

e. Uralic Studies

This small field was included at the very beginning of the project to test users' reaction to the ready availability of linguistic literature heretofore available only in book and, rarely, journal form. It was thought that the scarcity of materials in this area might be attributed to the lack of a central depository and dissemination mechanism. However, the project did not succeed in generating interest among the linguistic community in this particular field.

f. Metrics

Very few scholars in the United States work exclusively in metrics. It was included in the early stages of the project for reasons similar to those explained above in

connection with Uralic studies. Its coverage was also discontinued within the first six months of the project's existence.

g. Languages of the World

The Languages of the World project was organized by the Center for Applied Linguistics and funded by private foundations and Government agencies. It was included in an effort to make its findings available quickly and inexpensively to linguistic scholars at large. However, before the project began to produce a meaningful amount of material, it was dropped from the rapid dissemination project in favor of other fields.

h. Yugoslav Contrastive Studies

The Yugoslav contrastive studies, a project of the Center for Applied Linguistics and the University of Zagreb in Yugoslavia, was included (and subsequently discontinued) for reasons cited in connection with the Languages of the World project. Some papers which the project did submit for dissemination were included in ERIC.

i. Contrastive Studies in Linguistics

It was thought that this field might contain one or more hidden special interest groups which might surface in order to avail themselves of the project's services. Again, this was not the case. Although its scholars produce a considerable amount of literature in such areas as phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics, their interests center around particular topics or research areas rather than schools of thought or philosophies. Their findings rarely constitute an urgently needed information of the type which require fast dissemination. Over twenty papers in this field received by the project were found to be of general interest and were thus transferred to the Center's ERIC clearinghouse.

j. State of the Art Papers on Any Subject Within the Field of

Linguistics

State of the art papers in linguistics were included in the early stages of the project in the hope that the authors would choose the project's channels for the early dissemination of their papers. The scholars did not respond and this area was dropped because not a single paper was received in the first six months of the project.

Of the ten areas described above, only two, English Grammar and Contrastive Studies, were retained during the third phase of the project.

3. New publication outlets in the language sciences had already been created.

Within the last few years, the field of linguistics has witnessed the addition of several new journals which covered most of the areas handled by the project. Linguistic Inquiry, Language Sciences, Language and Society, and the Journal of Psycholinguistic Research are some of the better known ones. Most likely, their establishment was prompted by the same information problems which led to the present project. Continuing pressure, contributed to by PEGS and the present project, for new information exchange mechanisms and outlets, may have resulted in the recent reduction in the publication time lag in the new as well as the older journals in linguistics. Language reduced its publication time lag from two years to one, Linguistic Inquiry to six months, and the Journal of Psycholinguistic Research to seven months. The new journals, well received by the scholarly community, have lessened linguists' need for the present project's services.

4. The project did not provide ego satisfaction for the authors.

The satisfaction of seeing one's name in a professional journal was much greater than that of seeing it in the abstract bulletin of an experimental project. This was perhaps another factor which kept authors from utilizing the project's services. Given a choice, authors preferred to have their papers published in prestigious professional journals, even if it meant a delay of several months. If the project had had resources necessary for

more intensive publicity and the production of a high quality abstract journal (instead of a mimeographed abstract bulletin), and if it could have assured its audience of its permanency, it might have been able to compete successfully with other publications in the field. However, since the project's real objectives were the experimental studies of information exchange patterns, such competition was not considered.

5. The project's participation rules were too elaborate.

The following regulations concerning participation in the project's services were in effect for most of its duration:

a. All submitted papers must be refereed by an editorial board.
b. Submitted papers may not be copyrighted.
c. Only camera-ready copies (standard 8-1/2 x 11 paper) is acceptable.
d. Abstracts of the type specified for the subject matter involved must accompany papers.
e. Participants must provide self-addressed envelopes.
f. Participants must complete brief periodical questionnaires.

While the foregoing were designed to provide optimal data and to assure efficient and economical operation, they may have discouraged potential contributors. For example, some authors were reluctant to face refereeing by their peers. Instead, they preferred to circulate them among a few chosen colleagues and, following some revisions, submit final versions to regular journals. Also, scholars in the social sciences (unlike their colleagues in other sciences) are not accustomed to being told to abstract their articles in a special way. The initial success of the PEGS project could in part perhaps be attributed to the complete absence of such rules.

6. Comments of outside scholars.

When it became clear that the project could not be continued, the Center for Applied Linguistics invited 250 chairmen of language or linguistics departments at various academic institutions to comment on the project's usefulness, procedures, etc. The comments

contained in the 62 responses have been divided into the following broad categories:

1. No need for such a project in the field of linguistics	30
2. Did not know the project existed	15
3. Scholars don't like to expose raw papers to wider audiences	15
4. Project's rules and procedures were too involved	12
5. Project did not offer enough prestige to the authors	11
6. The project was an excellent idea and its lack of success should be blamed on the scholars	10
7. Microfiche is too tiring to read and hard copies are too expensive	5
8. Project's fields of coverage were outside the responding scholar's interests	3

7. Invisible Colleges - a possible myth.

The experience provided by the present project would seem to contradict the popular belief that there is a great deal of exchange of written information among the members of the invisible colleges. It also raises serious doubts about the existence of such colleges in the language sciences. Although the existence of special interest groups is a reality, it is usually a small number of their members who, by virtue of their productivity and talent, earn the name of an invisible college. Within the language sciences, and perhaps within the social science as a whole, such power groups engage in a multiplicity of functions of which the exchange of information is but one; job recommendations, appointments to influential panels and committees, etc., serve as good examples. Informal observations suggest that within linguistics, these influential bodies, rarely numbering more than twenty, are not large enough to generate a constant volume of material. Furthermore, because of scholarly disagreements, changes in academic orientation or status, and decline of productivity, the composition of such groups is rarely held constant. The initial strength and considerable productivity of the generative grammarians, who formed the nucleus of the PEGS program, were perhaps functions of the newness of their ideas and the fervor of their beliefs. Now, however, the field has splintered and is no longer the homogenous group it was.

A similar analysis concerning the existence of invisible colleges was offered by W. Paisley of Stanford University, who in a recent article stated that "the life expectancy of an invisible college is probably quite short. Those invisible colleges that have formed around an intriguing concept like cognitive dissonance will survive only as long as the concept continues to stimulate fresh research." He goes on to say that earlier they were more prevalent but "today, however, it is difficult to 'prove' that invisible colleges exist."*

Further analysis would probably yield additional conclusions supporting the existence not of invisible colleges, but of special interest groups within which the exchange of information is motivated by more tangible factors. In the highly successful fast dissemination project operated by the National Institutes of Health some years ago, it was the urgency of the need for new medical information. The success of other fast dissemination programs, as for example that operated by the Society of Automotive Engineers, can probably be attributed to the commercial profit to be derived from capitalizing on others' findings. However, such factors are probably rare in the social sciences.

The conclusions and observations offered above would seem to indicate that the actual amount of material generated by language scholars within invisible colleges or special interest groups is probably not sufficient to warrant the establishment of an elaborate fast information dissemination program such as the project under discussion.

---

*Paisley, William, "The Role of Invisible Colleges in Scientific Information Transfer", Educational Researcher, Volume 1, Number 4, pp. 5-8, 19.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following suggestions are offered to those who might want to organize fast dissemination services for members of special interest groups in the social sciences:

1. Study the information needs of the field involved beforehand and do not rely on intuition or the opinions of a few individuals.
2. Contact the editors of professional journals in the field with the aim of determining the actual publication time lag and the rate of rejection. This will help to determine the volume of material generated within the field.
3. Enlist the help and commitment of several outstanding scholars in the field. Their participation will help the program get off to a good start.
4. Do not call the program experimental. Those who will look upon the program as a publication medium of short duration will prefer to have their works cited in permanent publications.
5. The refereeing process employed by the program possibly should emphasize the scope rather than the quality of submitted papers, at least initially. Once the program is well accepted and successful, quality would become the primary criterion.
6. Make the rules of participation as simple as possible. However, if the program is short of money, insist on camera-ready copy.
7. Charge small fee services. Free services will load the program's mailing list with individuals not directly involved in the special interest group. Secondly, some scholars may look upon something free as not worthy of their participation.
8. Before deciding to publish an announcement bulletin, examine the possibilities of publishing the abstracts in a professional journal, either within its pages or as an insert. This will help cut mailing costs.

9. If the program does intend to have its own announcement bulletin, make it as substantial looking as possible.
10. When publicizing the program's services make it clear that the authors may formally publish their papers elsewhere at any time.
11. Collect as many good papers as possible before beginning operations.
12. Announce the program's existence at conferences, in journals, by direct mailing to university libraries and department chairmen in the field. Send out complimentary copies of the bulletin's first issue to as many potential participants as possible.
13. Allow the program one, preferably two, years before deciding on its success or usefulness.

APPENDIX I

Program for the Exchange of Generative Studies (PEGS) was started in early 1967 by a small group of Massachusetts Institute of Technology scholars who specialized in the field of generative-transformational linguistics. Realizing that the formal publication channels in the field of linguistics could not accommodate their information exchange needs, they decided to set up their own mechanism for the exchange of copies of unpublished papers among fifteen or so participating scholars. Later, as the number of participants grew, these individuals asked the ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to organize on a more formal basis the dissemination of their papers. Because this was a unique opportunity to gain an insight into the workings of what seemed a genuine invisible college, CAL agreed to take over the distribution of PEGS material on an experimental basis.

As its first step, CAL/ERIC instituted a number of eligibility rules in order to keep the PEGS free mailing list within manageable bounds. In spite of these rules, the mailing list grew to some eighty names. A total of some 40,000 mimeographed copies was reproduced and mailed within the first three months. Since the unexpected volume of material placed a considerable strain on the clearinghouse budget, the participants (all of whom received copies of every submitted paper) were required to deposit with CAL fifty dollars from which a charge of two and a half cents per page was deducted every time material was sent out. Contrary to expectations, these measures did not decrease participation, even on the part of those scholars whose interests did not fully coincide with the project's scope and who rarely contributed their own work. Faced with an expanding operation which it could not under the terms of its mandate handle for an extended period, the clearinghouse turned over the PEGS program in 1969 to a newly established linguistic journal.

A number of conclusions were drawn from the PEGS experience. First the success of the program could undoubtedly be attributed to the interest in generative studies. The relatively small number

of practitioners generated an unusual amount of material which, because of its novelty, was also of interest to linguists of "other colors". Secondly, many PEGS papers became often-cited references in linguistic literature thus giving the program free publicity as well as increasing the number of participants.

Another aspect of the program's early operation was the exclusive character of its participants, a small select circle, sharing with one another their latest research findings. This distinction diminished as participation increased until it completely disappeared towards the program's end. As the contributions of the program's most active initial contributors gradually ceased, it was discovered that they had once again formed a select circle of their own. The invisible college had gone underground again.

Subsequent inquiries revealed that PEGS charter members had become dissatisfied with the program because of:

(a) the decline in the general quality of PEGS papers.
(b) the lack of relevance to their interests of the papers submitted. (The lack of a refereeing mechanism permitted anyone to submit a paper on any subject.)
(c) the poor reproduction of the distributed papers.
(d) the necessity of paying for unwanted papers.

APPENDIX II

CAL Project for Dissemination of Linguistic Information

The Center for Applied Linguistics has inaugurated a project for the rapid dissemination of research results in the fields of English Grammar, Psycholinguistics, and Contrastive Studies. This experimental project, which is supported in part by funds from the Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology of the U.S. Office of Education, will issue abstract bulletins and will make the full texts available in the form of microfiche or hard copy (and, for Contrastive Studies, also microfilm). The abstract bulletins will be distributed free of charge to scholars actively engaged in any of the three fields. Papers submitted for inclusion in the project will be reviewed by an Editorial Advisory Committee for each field. The project director is A. Hood Roberts, with the assistance of Adam G. Woyna as project manager.

SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

English Grammar. Papers on English phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics as treated within the framework of modern theories of linguistic analysis, e.g. transformational, tagmemic, stratificational, structural, etc. Abstracts (100–200 words) will be of the *indicative* type, i.e. a broad statement of the contents and manner in which the information is presented.

Psycholinguistics: Research papers and theoretical or review papers of relevance to applied linguistics, including the areas of first and second language acquisition and language aptitude and proficiency testing. Abstracts (not to exceed 500 words) will be of the *informative* type, i.e. an objective summary (for research papers), or statement of thesis, development of proof, and conclusions (for theoretical papers).

Contrastive Studies: Contrastive analyses and error analyses; studies of the methodology of contrastive analysis and of its theoretical bases; studies of the theoretical implications of contrastive linguistics for general linguistics as well as of the implications for contrastive linguistics of such other fields as psychology and computational linguistics. Abstracts (30–50 words) will be of the *mini-abstract* type, i.e. consisting principally of key words.

GENERAL PROCEDURES

1. Scholars are invited to submit unpublished non-copyrighted papers or limited edition (up to 500) non-copyrighted papers for dissemination through the project.
2. Papers must be accompanied by an abstract of the type specified for the particular field (see above).
3. Documents should be on paper of standard size, 8½ x 11 inches.
4. When possible, documents should be submitted in duplicate.
5. Documents must be of good graphic quality for reproduction by microfiche or microfilm. Dittoed, smudged mimeograph, poor Xerox copies, etc., are not acceptable.
6. Those who wish to receive the abstract bulletins must provide the project with at least six self-addressed unstamped envelopes of 7 x 10 inch size or larger, with an indication on the envelope of the field (or fields) of interest.
7. Individuals who utilize the project's services will be requested to fill out a brief questionnaire once every six months, as an aid to evaluating the project's value and effectiveness.

Materials and correspondence should be addressed to: Project for Dissemination of Linguistic Information, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

APPENDIX III

abstract bulletin

Contrastive Studies

William Nemser, Editor

NUMBER 1 JANUARY 1971

Center for Applied Linguistics
Project for the Dissemination of Linguistic Information

CONTRASTIVE STUDIES

Editor: William Nemser

The scope of Contrastive Studies includes contrastive analyses and error analyses; studies of the methodology of contrastive analysis and of its theoretical bases; studies of the theoretical implications of contrastive linguistics for general linguistics as well as of the implications for contrastive linguistics of such other fields as psychology and computational linguistics.

Project Rules and Procedures

1. Anyone may submit unpublished non-copyrighted papers, or limited edition papers for rapid dissemination through the project.
2. Papers in the field of Contrastive Studies must fall within the scope stated above and must be accompanied by a mini-abstract of 30 to 50 words.
3. Documents must be on paper of standard size, 8½x11 inches and should also be of good graphic quality to permit microfilming.
4. When possible, documents should be submitted in duplicate.
5. Those who wish to receive the abstract bulletin must provide the project with six self-addressed, unstamped envelopes of 7x10 inch size, or larger, marked CONTRASTIVE STUDIES.
6. Individuals who utilize the project's services will be requested to fill out a brief questionnaire once every six months, as an aid in evaluating the project's value and effectiveness.

Document Ordering Procedures

The documents listed in this bulletin are available in the form of microfiche or as hard copy from the National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Md. 20014. When ordering, please provide the following information:

1. Acquisition numbers of desired documents (CS prefixed number preceding document listing).
2. Type of reproduction: microfiche (MF), or hard copy (HC).

Payment must accompany orders totalling less than $5.00. Add a handling charge of 50 cents to all orders. In the U.S. add sales tax as applicable.

Foreign Orders: A 15 percent service charge calculated to the nearest cent must accompany all foreign orders except those from Mexico and Canada. Export charges are eliminated on individual orders under $50.00 from Canada and Mexico; the 15 percent service charge applies, however, on all orders over $50.00.

The Project for the Dissemination of Linguistic Information is an experimental venture in the rapid dissemination of research results in the fields of English Grammar, Psycholinguistics and Contrastive Studies. It is funded by the Bureau of Libraries and Experimental Technology of the U.S. Office of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

CAL Project for the Dissemination of Linguistic Information
Center for Applied Linguistics
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Director: A. Hood Roberts Project Manager: Adam G. Woyna

Material and correspondence should be sent to the above address

APPENDIX III (continued)

CS 000 001
THE PREDICTABILITY OF INTERFERENCE PHENOMENA IN THE ENGLISH SPEECH OF NATIVE SPEAKERS OF HUNGARIAN
William Nemser, Center for Applied Linguistics, September 1969. 12 pp.

This experimental study was designed to test certain basic theoretical concepts underlying contrastive linguistics by reference to the perception and production of English stops and interdental fricatives by native speakers of Hungarian. The test results imply serious shortcomings in the theoretical concepts examined, at least as they apply to language learning, and even raise questions relevant to general linguistic theory.

Price: Microfiche $0.25; Hard copy $0.98

CS 000 002
PREDICATIVE PATTERNS FOR ENGLISH ADJECTIVES AND THEIR CONTRASTIVE CORRESPONDENTS IN SERBO-CROATIAN
Vladimir Ivir, University of Zagreb, 1970. 51 pp.

This paper represents an attempt at a contrastive analysis of predicative adjective patterns in English and their correspondents in Serbo-Croatian. Syntactico-semantic criteria are used to establish different classes of English adjectives whose systematic Serbo-Croatian correspondents are then examined for their possible effect on the Serbo-Croatian learner of English. [Part of the Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian—English Contrastive Project.]

Price: Microfiche $0.25; Hard copy $3.71

CS 000 003
REMARKS ON CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS AND TRANSLATION
Vladimir Ivir, University of Zagreb, 1970. 16 pp.

This paper argues that a distinction between translation and contrasting is not only useful but also necessary for contrastive analysis based on a translated corpus. It shows how multiple correspondences can be established between the original text and its translation and how they can be utilized in actual contrastive work. [Part of the Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian—English Contrastive Project.]

Price: Microfiche $0.25; Hard copy $1.26

CS 000 004
PROJEKT FÜR ANGEWANDTE KONTRASTIVE SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT (PROJECT ON APPLIED CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS), PAKS-Arbeitsbericht Nr. 1, Dezember 1968. 131 pp.

This volume contains three articles: (1) "Preliminary Remarks on Relative

APPENDIX IV

Project Statistics

Number of papers received	92
Number of papers rejected	18
Number of papers disseminated through the project	24
Number of papers referred to ERIC	50
Number of inquiries answered	450
Number of individuals and institutions on the mailing list	272

APPENDIX V

Document Handling and Other Office Procedures

Documents

The incoming documents were given preliminary evaluation by the project manager. Those which were clearly outside the project's scope were returned to the author with an appropriate explanation; those which were clearly of interest to language teachers and language program administrators were forwarded to ERIC; the remaining documents were divided according to their subject matter and forwarded to the series' editors for further evaluation. The editorial boards, consisting of one chief editor and four associate editors in each series, were associated with the project on a voluntary basis. The articles were to be evaluated by at least two editors in a given field and were to be returned with their comments to the project within ten days. Following the accumulation of at least eight accepted articles, their abstracts were re-typed for inclusion in the bulletin.

Bulletins

The bulletins consisted of loose pages, 8-1/2 x 11 inches in size, stapled together. The cover page, listing the name of the series, name of the editor, etc., was typeset by the printer and stocked in quantities in advance. The issue number and date were to be pasted on the cover page for subsequent issues before being reproduced by photo-offset or Xerox.

Each abstract listed in the bulletin, in addition to the regular bibliographic information, contained a number by which the full version could be ordered from a service bureau, as well as prices for microfiche and hard copy.

Mailing Procedures

As mentioned in the main body of the report, the project did not maintain current mailing lists. Instead, those wishing to receive the bulletin(s) were required to send sets of pre-addressed envelopes with an indication of their field(s) of interest on each envelope. The envelopes were grouped together

according to the subject matter and each set was tagged with a control slip on which the number of bulletin issues sent to the address was recorded. The project had intended to include in the mailing of every 6th issue of the bulletin a brief questionnaire designed to provide continuous data on the project's usefulness. In order to assure response, the mailing of subsequent issues was to be delayed until the participant returned the questionnaire.

APPENDIX VI

Cost Factors

Costs to the user (according to the 1970 agreement with the service bureau)

Microfiche	-	$0.25 each
Hard copy	-	0.04 per page
Bulletins	-	free

Costs to the project

Master microfiche	- $0.70, plus $0.06 per page filmed (minimum order fee $50.00)
Bulletins	- initial typesetting and printing costs of cover pages, and in-house xeroxing of inside pages at $0.02 per page